UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/474,948	12/30/1999	BRIAN PARSONNET	25302	2982

7590   08/27/2002

HONETWELL INC
HONEYWELL PLAZA
POB 524
MINNEAPOLIS, MN   554400524

EXAMINER
JEANTY, ROMAIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/474,948	PARSONNET ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Romain Jeanty	3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 May 2002* .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-9, 11-19 and 21-30* is/are rejected.

7) ☒ Claim(s) *10, 20 and 30* is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 December 1999* is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
        application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *5* .	6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Restriction/Election

1.   Applicant's election of Group I in Paper No. 6 is acknowledged. Because

applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction

requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP

§ 818.03(a)).

2.   Claims 1-30 are presented for examination.

Specification

3.   Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a

separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed

150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the

printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means"

and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist

readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the

title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns,"

"The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Objections

4.   Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities: The examiner suggests

that --of-- be inserted after capable. Appropriate correction is required.

1.   Claims 5, 15 and 25 are objected to because the language appears to be redundant.

It appears that the "second work flow" should be a "second request". Appropriate act correction

is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
>
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
>
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
>
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
>
> manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1-9, 11-19 and 21-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Gabbita et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,349,238) in view of Storch et al (U.S. Patent No.

5,920,846).

As to claim 1, Gabbita discloses:

creating a first work flow record used to control a first work flow associated with a first

service request and storing said work flow record in a storage device (col. 2, lines 33-37, and col.

8, lines 57-60), receiving a customer and vendor messages and storing the messages (col. 8 line

67 through col. 9 line 5, and col. 11, lines 29-34), transferring information and software data (col. 31, lines 8-10 col. 32, lines 53-63).

Gabbita et al discloses an appropriate billing system (col. 6, lines 43-51 and col. 18, lines 44-45). But Gabbita et al does not explicitly disclose an accounting controller associated with said main controller capable of identifying at least one fee associated with said first work flow and storing fee associated with said at least one fee in said first work flow record. Storch et on the other hand, discloses an integrated system and method for processing a service request for a customer which associates billing codes for determining a billing rates "fee" for the service provided to the customer (col. 19, lines 27-41). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the workflow for processing service orders of Gabbita et al by including associated billing codes for determining billing rates as evidenced by Storch et al. In so doing would provide an instant view or lookup of what a service will cost a customer or what a vendor will charge.

In addition, it is noted that Gabbita et al and Storch et al do not teach a main controller, an accounting controller. However, the examiner recognizes it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to note that theses functions are being performed by the combined teachings as noted above and these are label differences that do not contribute to any patentable differences.

As to claim 2, Gabbita et al discloses a plurality of workflow steps (see claim 1 above). The examiner interprets a plurality of workflow steps as a plurality of work flow definitions defining at least one process to be performed by a controller. It is further noted that Gabbita et al

teaches that the workflow steps are within an interface module to be used by a controller to manage the workflow. Note column 5, lines 33-38.

As to claims 3 and 4 Gabbita et al discloses work orders or a work plan being modified (col. 10, lines 42-50 and column 14, lines 2-5), but Gabbita et al and Storch et al fail to explicitly disclose which party modifies the work orders or the work plan (col. 10, lines 42-50). However, a customer or vendor could modify work orders based on the price it will cost to repair a customer's equipment or the time it will take to fix or repair the equipment. Usually customers and vendor negotiate on prices. Therefore, allowing a customer or vendor to modify the work flow definitions would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art in order to have a dynamic or a flexible system.

As to claim 5, Gabbita et al and Storch et al substantially disclose the invention as claimed. In addition, Gabbita et al discloses a workflow step "a primary work flow record" associated with a service request (col. 2, lines 29-43). Gabbita et al does not explicitly a secondary workflow record associate with a second request. However, the system of Gabbita et al has the functional limitation of having a secondary workflow record associated with a second request. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the Gabbita et al's system to incorporate a secondary workflow record in order to track the workflow associated with the processing of the service requests.

As to claim 6, Gabbita et al and Storch et al fails to disclose said second work flow is associated with a second service request generated by said first vendor in response to said first service request generated by said first customer. However, these features are interpreted as a customer sending a request to make additional changes such as repairing or rebuilding a part and

the vendor agrees to do so resulted in having a second work flow being associated with a second

service request.

As to claim 7, the combination of Gabbita et al and Storch et al discloses charging billing

rates to a customer for a to service request (see claim 1 above) but Gabbita et al and Storch et al

fail to disclose identifying at least one additional fee associated with a said second work flow and

storing second fee associated with said at least one additional fee in said first work flow record.

However, these features are equivalent having more steps or additional labor time to perform a

service request for a customer. Including these features into Gabbita et al and Storch et al would

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art for charging the customer an additional

fee for the incurred labor.

As to claim 8, Gabbita et al discloses sending a customer's billing information to be

processed (col. 6, lines 33-51), but Gabbita et al does not explicitly disclose associating a fee for

a second work flows record. Storch et al discloses associating **rates** for any number of workflow

records for a service order (i.e. col. 19, lines 33-41). Therefore, it would be obvious to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Gabbita et al to incorporate rates for a

number of record records as evidenced by Storch. Doing so would provide an instant view or

lookup of what a service will cost a customer or what a vendor will charge.

As to claim 9, Gabbita et al discloses a web based interface module. Such interface

module has the capability to provide customized view of service requests (col. 5, lines 33-48).

As to claim 11, Gabbita discloses:

A communication network (col. 4, lines 64-66);

A plurality of customer data processing devices "computer systems" for generating

service requests (see figure 1 elements 106-114 and col. 13, lines 15-23), and a plurality of

vendor processing units "workstations" capable of fulfilling said customer service requests (i.e.

providing the requests to the customers (i.e. receiving the customer's requests and processing the

customer's requests) (see figure 1A element 120, and col. 8, lines 4-9, lines 44-60 lines);

A system for monitoring and controlling work flows associated with said service requests

between the customers and said plurality of vendors (col. 2, lines 38-41 and col. 18, lines 45-49),

creating a first work flow record used to control a first work flow associated with a first service

request and storing said work flow record in a storage device (col. 2, lines 33-37, and col. 8, lines

57-60), receiving a customer and vendor messages and storing the messages (col. 8 line 67

through col. 9 line 5, and col. 11, lines 29-34), transferring information and software data (col.

31, lines 8-10 col. 32, lines 53-63).

Gabbita et al discloses an appropriate billing system (col. 6, lines 43-51 and col. 18, lines

44-45). But Gabbita et al fails to explicitly disclose an accounting controller associated with said

main controller capable of identifying at least one fee associated with said first work flow and

storing fee associated with said at least one fee in said first work flow record. Storch et on the

other hand, discloses an integrated system and method for processing a service request for a

customer which associates billing codes for determining a billing rates "fee" for the service

provided to the customer (col. 19, lines 27-41). It would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the workflow for

processing service orders of Gabbita et al by including associated billing codes for determining

billing rates as evidenced by Storch et al. In so doing would provide an instant view or lookup of

what a service will cost a customer or what a vendor will charge.

In addition, it is noted that Gabbita et al and Storch et al do not teach a main controller,

an accounting controller. However, the examiner recognizes it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art to note that theses functions are being performed by the

combined teachings as noted above and these are label differences that do not contribute to any

patentable differences.

As to claim 12, Gabbita et al discloses a plurality of workflow steps (see claim 1 above).

The examiner interprets a plurality of workflow steps as a plurality of workflow definitions

defining at least one process to be performed by a controller. It is further noted that Gabbita et al

teaches that the workflow steps are within an interface module to be used by a controller to

manage the workflow. Note column 5, lines 33-38.

As to claims 13 and 14, Gabbita et al discloses work orders or a work plan being

modified (col. 10, lines 42-50 and column 14, lines 2-5), but Gabbita et al and Storch et al fail to

explicitly disclose which party modifies the work orders or the work plan (col. 10, lines 42-50).

However, a customer or vendor could modify work orders based on the price it will cost to repair

a customer's equipment or the time it will take to fix or repair the equipment. Usually customers

and vendor negotiate on prices. Therefore, allowing a customer or vendor to modify the work

flow definitions would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art in order to have

a dynamic or a flexible system.

As to claim 15, Gabbita et al and Storch et al substantially disclose the invention as

claimed. In addition, Gabbita et al discloses a workflow step "a primary work flow record"

associated with a service request (col. 2, lines 29-43). Gabbita et al does not explicitly a secondary workflow record associate with a second request. However, the system of Gabbita et al has the functional limitation of having a secondary workflow record associated with a second request. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the Gabbita et al's system to incorporate a secondary workflow record in order to track the workflow associated with the processing of the service requests.

As to claim 16, Gabbita et al and Storch et al does not disclose said second work flow is associated with a second service request generated by said first vendor in response to said first service request generated by said first customer. However, these features are interpreted as a customer sending a request to make additional changes such as repairing or rebuilding a part and the vendor agrees to do so resulted in having a second workflow being associated with a second service request.

As to claim 17, the combination of Gabbita et al and Storch et al discloses charging billing rates to a customer for a to service request (see claim 1 above) but Gabbita et al and Storch et al fail to disclose identifying at least one additional fee associated with a said second work flow and storing second fee associated with said at least one additional fee in said first work flow record. However, these features are equivalent having more steps or additional labor time to perform a service request for a customer. Including these features into Gabbita et al and Storch et al would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art for charging the customer an additional fee for the incurred labor.

As to claim 18, Gabbita et al discloses sending a customer's billing information to be processed (col. 6, lines 33-51), but Gabbita et al does not explicitly disclose associating a fee for

a second work flows record. Storch et al discloses associating **rates** for any number of workflow

records for a service order (i.e. col. 19, lines 33-41). Therefore, it would be obvious to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Gabbita et al to incorporate rates for a

number of record records as evidenced by Storch. Doing so would provide an instant view or

lookup of what a service will cost a customer or what a vendor will charge.

As to claim 19, Gabbita et al discloses a web based interface module. Such interface

module has the capability to provide customized view of service requests (col. 5, lines 33-48).

As to claim 21, Gabbita et al discloses:

A communication network (col. 4, lines 64-66);

A plurality of customer data processing devices "computer systems" for generating

service requests (see figure 1 elements 106-114 and col. 13, lines 15-23), and a plurality of

vendor processing units "workstations" capable of fulfilling said customer service requests (i.e.

providing the requests to the customers (i.e. receiving the customer's requests and processing the

customer's requests) (see figure 1A element 120, and col. 8, lines 4-9, lines 44-60 lines);

A system for monitoring and controlling work flows associated with said service requests

between the customers and said plurality of vendors (col. 2, lines 38-41 and col. 18, lines 45-49),

creating a first work flow record used to control a first work flow associated with a first service

request and storing said work flow record in a storage device (col. 2, lines 33-37, and col. 8, lines

57-60), receiving a customer and vendor messages and storing the messages (col. 8 line 67

through col. 9 line 5, and col. 11, lines 29-34), transferring information and software data (col.

31, lines 8-10 col. 32, lines 53-63).

Gabbita et al discloses an appropriate billing system (col. 6, lines 43-51 and col. 18, lines 44-45). But Gabbita et al fails to explicitly disclose identifying at least one fee associated with said first work flow and storing fee associated with said at least one fee in said first work flow record. Storch et on the other hand, discloses an integrated system and method for processing a service request for a customer which associates billing codes for determining a billing rates "fee" for the service provided to the customer (col. 19, lines 27-41). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the workflow for processing service orders of Gabbita et al by including associated billing codes for determining billing rates as evidenced by Storch et al. In so doing would provide an instant view or lookup of what a service will cost a customer or what a vendor will charge.

As to claim 22, Gabbita et al discloses a plurality of workflow steps (see claim 1 above). The examiner interprets a plurality of workflow steps as a plurality of workflow definitions defining at least one process to be performed by a controller. It is further noted that Gabbita et al teaches that the workflow steps are within an interface module to be used by a controller to manage the workflow. Note column 5, lines 33-38.

As to claims 23 and 24, Gabbita et al discloses work orders or a work plan being modified (col. 10, lines 42-50 and column 14, lines 2-5), but Gabbita et al and Storch et al fail to explicitly disclose which party modifies the work orders or the work plan (col. 10, lines 42-50). However, a customer or vendor could modify work orders based on the price it will cost to repair a customer's equipment or the time it will take to fix or repair the equipment. Usually customers and vendor negotiate on prices. Therefore, allowing a customer or vendor to modify the work

flow definitions would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art in order to have

a dynamic or a flexible system.

As to claim 25, Gabbita et al and Storch et al substantially disclose the invention as

claimed. In addition, Gabbita et al discloses a workflow step "a primary work flow record"

associated with a service request (col. 2, lines 29-43). Gabbita et al does not explicitly a

secondary workflow record associate with a second request. However, the system of Gabbita et

al has the functional limitation of having a secondary workflow record associated with a second

request. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to

modify the Gabbita et al's system to incorporate a secondary workflow record in order to track

the workflow associated with the processing of the service requests.

As to claim 26, the combination of Gabbita et al and Storch fails to disclose said second

work flow is associated with a second service request generated by said first vendor in response

to said first service request generated by said first customer. However, these features are

interpreted as a customer sending a request to make additional changes such as repairing or

rebuilding a part and the vendor agrees to do so resulted in having a second workflow being

associated with a second service request.

As to claim 27, Gabbita et al and Storch et al substantially disclose charging billing rates

to a customer for a to service request (see claim 1 above) but Gabbita et al and Storch et al fail to

disclose identifying at least one additional fee associated with a said second work flow and

storing second fee associated with said at least one additional fee in said first work flow record.

However, these features are equivalent having more steps or additional labor time to perform a

service request for a customer. Including these features into Gabbita et al and Storch et al would

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art for charging the customer an additional

fee for the incurred labor.

As to claim 8, Gabbita et al discloses sending a customer's billing information to be

processed (col. 6, lines 33-51), but Gabbita et al does not explicitly disclose associating a fee for

a second work flows record. Storch et al discloses associating **rates** for any number of workflow

records for a service order (i.e. col. 19, lines 33-41). Therefore, it would be obvious to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Gabbita et al to incorporate rates for a

number of record records as evidenced by Storch. Doing so would provide an instant view or

lookup of what a service will cost a customer or what a vendor will charge.

As to claim 29, Gabbita et al discloses a web based interface module. Such interface

module has the capability to provide customized view of service requests (col. 5, lines 33-48).

Allowable Subject Matter

7.   Claims 10, 20 and 30 are objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims, but

would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base

claim and any intervening claims.

8.   The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Prior art of record taken alone or in combination fails to teach a main controller

transferring said customized computer executable application from a first data processing device

associated with said first vendor to at least one of a second data processing device associated

with said main controller and a third data processing device associated with said customer,

wherein said main controller transfers said customized computer-executable application to said

at least one of said second data processing device and said data processing device to cause said

customized computer-executable application to execute more efficiently.

Conclusion

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed Romain Jeanty whose telephone number is (703) 308-9585. The

examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday from 7:30 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner are not successful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq R Hafiz

can be reached at (703) 305-9643.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 305-7687

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive,

Arlington VA., and seventh floor receptionist.

Romain Jeanty

August 11, 2002   Patent Examiner

Art Unit 3623